

CREATION EVOLUTION DEBATE MUST BE DECIDED ON FACTS

May 18, 2011 (David Cloud, Fundamental Baptist Information Service, P.O. Box 610368, Port Huron, MI 48061, 866-295-4143, fbns@wayoflife.org; for instructions about subscribing and unsubscribing or changing addresses, see the information paragraph at the end of the article) -

The creation-evolution debate is too important to accept anything less than confirmed facts.

In 1922, William Jennings Bryan warned,

“It is no light matter to impeach the veracity of the Scriptures in order to accept, not a truth--not even a theory--but a mere hypothesis” (*In His Image*, 1922, p. 94).

Bryan was right, and nearly a century later, evolution remains “a mere hypothesis.”

The outcome of a murder trial requires evidence “beyond a reasonable doubt,” because so much is at stake, and we should require no less on the issue of creation vs. evolution, which potentially has eternal consequences.

The Bible claims to be the revelation of God to man. It claims to reveal God, man’s beginning and fall, the way of salvation, and the future. If the Bible is true, there is a heaven and a hell, man will live forever in one place or another, and salvation is only through personal faith in Jesus Christ.

This is too grave an issue to be decided on the basis of anything other than solid proof that the Bible is *not* to be trusted and that evolution is an absolute science.

Yet evolution provides no such proof. In fact, it’s major “evidences” are doubted and disputed even by its own adherents.

Juan Arsuaga candidly advises,

“... those seeking absolute truth or an immutable and unassailable dogma should look in a field other than science” (*Neanderthal’s Necklace*, p. 17)

I have many books in my library ***by evolutionists questioning and outright debunking the major principles of evolution***. Consider a few examples:

I. L. Cohen: “... every single concept advanced by the theory of evolution (and amended thereafter) is imaginary and it is not supported by the scientifically established facts of microbiology, fossils, and mathematical probability concepts. Darwin was wrong. ... The theory of evolution may be the worst mistake made in science” (Cohen, *Darwin Was Wrong: A Study in Probabilities*, 1984, pp. 209, 210; Cohen is a mathematician and researcher, a member of the New York Academy of Sciences).

David Berlinski: “The structures of life are complex, and complex structures get made in this, the purely human world, only by a process of deliberate design. An act of intelligence is required to bring even a thimble into being; why should the artifacts of life be different? ... For many years, biologists have succeeded in keeping skepticism on the circumference of evolutionary thought, where paleontologists, taxonomists, and philosophers linger. But the burning fringe of criticism is now contracting, coming ever closer to the heart of Darwin's doctrine” (*The Deniable Darwin*, June 1, 1996; Berlinski, Ph.D. in philosophy from Princeton and post doctoral work in mathematics and biology from Columbia University, has taught philosophy, mathematics, and English at Stanford, Rutgers, the University of Paris, and elsewhere).

Michael Denton: “My fundamental problem with the theory is that there are so many highly complicated organs, systems and structures, from the nature of the lung of a bird, to the eye of the rock lobster, for which I cannot conceive of how these things have come about in terms of a gradual accumulation of random changes. It strikes me as being a flagrant denial of common sense to swallow that all these things were built up by accumulative small random changes. This is simply a nonsensical claim, especially for the great majority of cases, where nobody can think of any credible explanation of how it came about. And this is a very profound question which everybody skirts, everybody brushes over, everybody tries to sweep under the carpet” (“An interview with Michael Denton,” Access Research Network, Vol. 15. No. 2, 1995; the interview was produced in conjunction with the University of California and was the first in a series of interviews with noted scientists and educators entitled *Focus on Darwinism*; Denton, Ph.D. in biochemistry from King's College London, is Senior Research Fellow in molecular biology at the University of Otago, New Zealand).

Soren Lovtrup. “I believe that one day the Darwinian myth will be ranked the greatest deceit in the history of science” (*Darwinism: The Refutation of a Myth*, 1987; Lovtrup is a Swedish biologist and the author of *Epigenetics: A Treatise on Theoretical Biology* and *The Phylogeny of Vertebrata*).

Richard Milton. “I am seriously concerned, on purely rational grounds, that generations of school and university teachers have been led to accept speculation as scientific theory and faulty data as scientific fact; that this process has accumulated a mountainous catalog of mingled fact and fiction that can no longer be contained by the sparsely elegant theory; and that it is high time that the theory was taken out of its ornate Victorian glass cabinet and examined with a fresh and skeptical eye” (*Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, 1992, p. 4; Milton is a science journalist and design engineer and a member of Mensa, the high-IQ organization. He has been a member of the Geologists' Association for over 30 years).

Michael Pitman. “Neither observation nor controlled experiment has shown natural selection manipulating mutations so as to produce a new gene, hormone, enzyme system or organ” (Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, 1984, pp. 67, 68; Pitman was a chemistry professor at Cambridge).

Wolfgang Smith. “The point, however, is that the doctrine of evolution has swept the world, not on the strength of its scientific merits, but precisely in its capacity as a Gnostic myth. It affirms, in effect, that living beings created themselves, which is, in essence, a metaphysical claim. ... Thus, in the final analysis, evolutionism is in truth a metaphysical doctrine decked out in scientific garb” (*Teilhardism and the New Religion*, p. 24; Smith, Ph.D. in mathematics from Columbia University, has been a mathematics professor at MIT, UCLA, and Oregon State University).

Lee Spetner. “Despite the insistence of evolutionists that evolution is a fact, it is really no more than an improbable story. No one has ever shown that macroevolution can work. Most evolutionists assume that macroevolution is just a long sequence of microevolutionary events, but no one has ever shown it to be so” (“Lee Spetner/Edward Max Dialogue,” 2001, *The True Origin Archive*; Spetner, Ph.D. in physics from MIT, worked with the Applied Physics Laboratory of the John Hopkins University from 1951-70).

David Stove. “Huxley should not have needed Darwinism to tell him--since any intelligent child of about eight could have told him--that in a ‘continual free fight of each other against all’ there would soon be no children, no women, and hence, no men. In other words, that the human race could not possibly exist *now*, unless cooperation had *always* been stronger than competition, both between women and their children, and between men and the children and women whom they protect and provide for. ... Such cases, I need hardly say, never bother armor-plated neo-Darwinians. But then *no* cases, possible or even actual, ever do bother them. ... In neo-Darwinism’s house there are many mansions: so many, indeed, that if a certain awkward fact will not fit into one mansion, there is sure to be another one into which it will fit to admiration” (*Darwinian Fairytales: Selfish Genes, Errors of Heredity, and Other Fables of Evolution*, pp. 9, 39; Stove was an Australian philosopher, educator, and author who taught philosophy at the University of New South Wales and the University of Sydney).

William Thompson. “As we know, there is a great divergence of opinion among biologists, not only about the causes of evolution but even about the actual process. This divergence exists because the evidence is unsatisfactory and does not permit any certain conclusion. It is therefore right and proper to draw the attention of the non-scientific public to the disagreements about evolution. But some recent remarks of evolutionists show that they think this unreasonable. This situation, where scientific men rally to the defence of a doctrine they are unable to define scientifically, much less demonstrate with scientific rigour, attempting to maintain its credit with the public by the suppression of criticism and the elimination of difficulties, is abnormal and undesirable in science” (Introduction to *The Origin of Species*, 6th Edition, 1956, p. xxii; Thompson was Entomologist and Director of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control, Ottawa, Canada).

Colin Patterson. “The explanation value of the evolutionary hypothesis of common origin is nil! Evolution not only conveys no knowledge, it seems to convey anti-knowledge. How could I

work on evolution ten years and learn nothing from it? Most of you in this room will have to admit that in the last ten years we have seen the basis of evolution go from fact to faith! It does seem that the level of knowledge about evolution is remarkably shallow. We know it ought not to be taught in high school, and that's all we know about it" (Colin Patterson, senior paleontologist at the Museum of Natural History, London, in an address given at the American Museum of Natural History, Nov. 5, 1981; cited from White and Comninellis, *Darwin's Demise*, p. 47).

The chapter "Testimonies of Scientists Who Believe the Bible" features 51 Ph.D.s who state that evolution is not scientifically proven. Consider a few examples. Most of these either once believed in evolution or still do in some way:

"Despite all the millions of pages of evolutionist publications--from journal articles to textbooks to popular magazine stories--which assume and imply that material processes are entirely adequate to accomplish macroevolutionary miracles, there is in reality no rational basis for such belief" (John Baumgardner, Ph.D. in geophysics and space physics from UCLA, *In Six Days: Why Fifty Scientists Choose to Believe in Creation*, edited by John Ashton, p. 230).

"I reviewed many books on Darwinism and from them outlined the chief evidence for evolution, which included vestigial organs, homology, ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny, beneficial mutations, evidence of poor design, the fossil record, atavisms, nascent organs, the argument from imperfect, natural selection, microevolution versus macroevolution, shared genetic errors, the backward retina, junk DNA, and other topics. ... Slowly, but surely, I WAS ABLE TO ELIMINATE ALL OF THE MAIN ARGUMENTS USED TO SUPPORT EVOLUTIONISM BY RESEARCHING SECULAR LITERATURE ONLY. At some point I crossed the line, realizing the case against evolutionism was overwhelming and conversely, so was the case in favor of the alternative, creationism" (Jerry Bergman, Ph.D. in human biology from Columbia Pacific University and Ph.D. in measurement and evolution from Wayne State University, *Persuaded by the Evidence*, chapter 4).

"There is not one single instance whereby all the tests essential to the establishment of the scientific validity of evolution have been satisfied. There are hypotheses, grandiose models, suppositions, and inferences, all of which are formulated and reinforced within the collective and self-serving collaborations of the evolutionist gurus. However, none of this amounts to true scientific evidence for evolution. It was in the 1970s that, to my great surprise, bewilderment, and disgust, I became enlightened to this. Up until that time I had not given the evolution matter very much thought. On the contrary, I presumed that researchers committed to the study of evolution possessed the same integrity as that expected of any credible scientist. ... Subsequently, the greatest embarrassment of all was for me to find that THERE SIMPLY WAS NO VALID SCIENCE WHATEVER, in any of these numerous publications touting evolution" (Edward Boudreaux, Ph.D. in chemistry from Tulane University, professor emeritus of chemistry at the University of New Orleans, *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, pp. 205, 206).

"Over a period of a couple of years, it became apparent to me that the theory of evolution has no legitimate factual evidence" (John Cimbala, Ph.D. in aeronautics from the California Institute of Technology, *In Six Days*, p. 201).

"As I looked at the evidence--trying to be a dispassionate scientist--I could not find the evidence for the multitudes of intermediate forms which should exist if evolution was true" (Raymond Jones, Ph.D. in biology, "Standing Firm," *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 28).

"It is my conviction that if any professional biologist will take adequate time to examine carefully the assumptions upon which the macro-evolutionary doctrine rests, and the observational and laboratory evidence that bears on the problem of origins, he/she will conclude that there are substantial reasons for doubting the truth of this doctrine" (Dean Kenyon, Ph.D. in biophysics

from Stanford University, "The Creationist View of Biological Origins," *NEX4 Journal*, Spring 1984, p. 33).

"I have never seen any evidence for evolution. All that I see around me in nature points to a divine designer" (Angela Meyer, Ph.D. in horticultural science from the University of Sydney, *In Six Days*, p. 143).

"How secure is the idea that there is an uninterrupted creative sequence from the big bang through the formation of the solar system, the solidification of the earth, the spontaneous generation of life, and the evolution of plants, animals, and humans to end in the world around us today? Is this scheme impregnable? By no means. It has fatal gaps and inconsistencies" (Colin Mitchell, Ph.D. in desert terrain geography from Cambridge University, *In Six Days*, pp. 318, 319).

"I no longer believed there was any validity to Darwinism, having become convinced of this as much by the evolutionist literature I had read as by the creationist books. The standards of evidence supporting evolution seemed trivial compared to the evidence on which engineers have to base their work" (Henry Morris, Ph.D. in hydraulics and hydrology from the University of Minnesota, *Persuaded by the Evidence*, p. 222).

"I have studied a lot of arguments from evolutionists; I have had seven formal debates with evolutionary professors at universities, and I have never read or heard any scientific fact that contradicts what the Bible says. There are evolutionist's interpretations of the facts, but the facts themselves are not contrary to Scripture" (Terry Mortenson, Ph.D. in the History of Geology from Coventry University, interview with David Cloud at the Creation Museum, June 23, 2009).

"Molecular evolution is not based on scientific authority. There is no publication in the scientific literature--in prestigious journals, speciality journals, or books--that describes how molecular evolution of any real, complex, biochemical system either did occur or even might have occurred. ... In the face of the enormous complexity that modern biochemistry has uncovered in the cell, the scientific community is paralyzed" (Michael Behe, Ph.D. in biology from the University of Pennsylvania, *Darwin's Black Box*, chapters 8, 9).

"For three years, I used all the evolutionary arguments I knew so well [to debate chemistry professor Dr. Charles Signorino]. For three years, I lost every scientific argument. In dismay, I watched the myth of evolution evaporate under the light of scientific scrutiny, while the scientific case for Creation-Corruption-Catastrophe-Christ just got better and better. It's no wonder that the ACLU (actually the anti-Christian lawyers union) fights by any means to censor any scientific challenge to evolution!" (Gary Parker, Ph.D. in biology/geology from Ball State University, *Persuaded by the Evidence*, p. 254).

"After all the research to date, we are still unable to explain the origin of galaxies as inhomogeneities in the universe from the perspective of evolution. We seem, in fact, to be further away from a satisfactory explanation of evolutionary galactic origins than we were when we started to study the subject, using modern physical theory. As in one field of science, so in all others, we are unable to explain the origin of the beautiful and complex realities of this world from an evolutionist approach" (John Rankin, Ph.D. in mathematical physics from the University of Adelaide, *In Six Days: Why Fifty Scientists Choose to Believe in Creation*, p. 122).

"Progressing in my studies, I slowly realized that evolution survives as a paradigm only as long as the evidence is picked and chosen and the great poll of data that is accumulating on life is ignored. As the depth and breadth of human knowledge increases, it washes over us a flood of evidence deep and wide, all pointing to the conclusion that life is the result of design" (Timothy Standish, Ph.D. in biology and public policy from George Mason University, *In Six Days*, p. 117).

"If the evolution or creationism discussion were decided by sensible appeals to reason, evolution would long ago have joined the great philosophical foolishnesses of the past, with issues such as how many angels can dance on the head of a pin, or the flat-earth concept. ... evolution is not adhered to on scientific grounds at all. Rather, it is clung to though flying in the face of reason,

with an incredible, fanatical, and irrational religious fervor. It loudly claims scientific support when, in fact, it has none worthy of the name" (Ker Thomson, D.Sc. in geophysics from the Colorado School of Mines, former director of the U.S. Air Force Terrestrial Sciences Laboratory, *In Six Days*, p. 217).

"The principles and observations of true science do not contradict a literal interpretation of Genesis 1, but in fact offer support for the creation of all things in six days!" (Jeremy Walter, Ph.D. in mechanical engineering, Pennsylvania State University, *In Six Days: Why Fifty Scientists Choose to Believe in Creation*, pp. 21, 22).

"I am firmly convinced that there is far more scientific evidence supporting a recent, six-day creation and global flood than there is an old earth and evolution" (Keith Wanser, Ph.D. in condensed matter physics from the University of California, Irvine, *In Six Days*, pp. 103, 104).

"I became convinced that people believe in evolution because they choose to do so. It has nothing at all to do with evidence. Evolution is not a fact, as so many bigots maintain. There is not a shred of evidence for the evolution of life on earth" (A.J. Monty White, Ph.D. in gas kinetics from the University College of Wales, *In Six Days*, pp. 257, 259, 260, 263).

In 1969 Dr. John Grebe, speaking to the Texas State School Board, offered a \$1,000 reward to anyone who could "provide any first example of physically verifiable evidence (or even a basic mathematical model) sufficient to elevate the hypothesis of macroevolution up to the status of scientific theory. The challenge was offered to the top evolutionary scientists of that day. Grebe was the director of nuclear and basic research at Dow Chemical, Midland, Michigan. One man who tried to collect was atheist David Bradbury. He had been a brash defender of evolution for 20 years since his university days. Not only was he not able to find the evidence to defend evolution, Bradbury eventually became a Bible-believing Christian and he re-offered Grebe's challenge. On January 28, 2002, Bradbury wrote:

"This \$1,000 challenge remains open (and uncollected). Until someone (teacher, board member or professor) can cite even a single example of empirically confirmable evidence that random shifts in gene frequency acted upon by natural selection can (or does) cumulatively collect to produce macro-evolutionary change, it would appear only reasonable to responsibly refrain from introducing such conjecture as proper scientific theory to students and to the public" ("Report on Comments on Proposed Modifications to Draft of Ohio Science Academic Content Standards," <http://www.arn.org/docs/ohio/ohioreport020402.htm>, viewed April 5, 2010).

There is no evidence that a self-replicating cell could arise from non life. There is no evidence that mutations and natural selection could account for the vast complexity of life. There is no evidence that man did arise from or even could have arisen from the animal kingdom. There is no evidence that gradualism could have produced the global distribution of fossils.

In spite of the lack of evidence, multitudes have gone out into eternity trusting that the Bible is wrong and that evolution is true.

Consider the sad case of Arthur Keith. He was one of the greatest anatomists of the 20th century, but he was duped by the Piltdown hoax. His book *The Antiquity of Man* centered on Piltdown, treating it as the missing link. In his autobiography Keith described attending evangelistic meetings and being on the verge of converting to Christ, but he rejected the gospel because he

felt that the Genesis account of creation had been proven to be a myth (Lubenow, p. 59). In reality, Keith gambled his eternity on evolutionary myths. In 1953, he was informed that the Piltdown fossils were a hoax, but by then he was an old man steeped in humanistic rationalism and a “pronounced opponent of the Christian faith.” As far as we know, he went to his grave in that condition. He should have looked at the evidence for the Bible much more carefully and prayerfully. He should *not* have been so ready to believe what Bible critics and evolutionists taught. The stake was far too high, and the same is true today.

I, for one, refuse to stake eternity on unproven theories that are constantly changing. I don’t care if the entire scientific world believes that evolution is true. They must provide real evidence to support their theory, and they have never done this.

While many in the early 20th century turned away from the Bible because of evolution’s popularity, many others were wise and refused to follow such flimsy “science.” One of these was John Mann, who was awarded the M.B.E. by the Queen of England for his work in solving the cactus problem in Australia. The cactus, which had been imported into the country in 1839, was proliferating out of control and by 1914 had taken over 60 million acres of prime farm/ranch land. Mann discovered how to mass breed the *Cactoblastic cactorum*, a caterpillar that is a natural enemy of the cactus. In an interview in 1982, he reminisced about the debate over evolution in the 1920s and how he decided not to accept it.

“[O]ne man who influenced me was the Professor of Anatomy at the University of Adelaide. He wrote the Progress Prize Memorial Lecture, ‘The Ancestry of Man.’ He wrote about the discovery of an exceedingly early fossil anthropoid in America. This fossil animal was named ‘Hesperopithecus.’ Not only was it named but its complete form, both male and female, were shown as a whole page illustration in an *English Illustrated Weekly*, as part of an article on ‘The Early Humanoid in America’, by Professor Elliot Smith. But the anatomy professor pointed out the only evidence on which this was based, consisted of a single water-worn molar tooth, and that there were other learned authorities of the day, such as Dr Smith Woodward, had suggested that it was the tooth of a bear. When I read that in 1923, I thought to myself, ‘Well, evolutionary theory appears to have been built upon 99% imagination and 1% fossils,’ so I maintained that as a Christian I would believe in the Bible until somebody could come up with any definite proof that men had evolved from animals. ...

“One gentleman had built up a key for flies. It was fine looking. However after he had sent it to the Linnaean Society in Sydney for publication, he found more insects which altered his whole concept, so he sent them a telegram and told them not to publish his key until further notice. Finally he almost turned it upside down with his next key. So I said to myself, ‘Well I believe God; and I believe the Bible; and these men are not producing anything concrete that would make me disbelieve. Until they do I am just going to go on as I am’” (“Famous Creation Scientists: Interview with John Mann,” *Answers in Genesis*, October 1982).

While evolution is not back up with solid evidence, the Bible is. There are “many infallible proofs” that the Bible is what it claims to be, the divinely inspired Word of God. (See “The Bible’s Proof” at the Way of Life web site.)

Distributed by Way of Life Literature's Fundamental Baptist Information Service, an e-mail listing for Fundamental Baptists and other fundamentalist, Bible-believing Christians. Established in 1974, Way of Life Literature is a fundamental Baptist preaching and publishing ministry based in Bethel Baptist Church, London, Ontario, of which Wilbert Unger is the founding Pastor. Brother Cloud lives in South Asia where he has been a church planting missionary since 1979. OUR GOAL IN THIS PARTICULAR ASPECT OF OUR MINISTRY IS NOT DEVOTIONAL BUT IS TO PROVIDE INFORMATION TO ASSIST PREACHERS IN THE PROTECTION OF THE CHURCHES IN THIS APOSTATE HOUR. This material is sent only to those who personally subscribe to the list. If somehow you have subscribed unintentionally, following are the instructions for removal. The Fundamental Baptist Information Service mailing list is automated. To SUBSCRIBE, go to <http://www.wayoflife.org/wayoflife/subscribe.html> . TO UNSUBSCRIBE OR CHANGE ADDRESSES, go to the very bottom of any email received from us and click "Manage My Subscription." If you have any trouble with this, please let us know. We take up a quarterly offering to fund this ministry, and those who use the materials are expected to participate (Galatians 6:6) if they can. Some of the articles are from O Timothy magazine, which is in its 27th year of publication. Way of Life publishes many helpful books. The catalog is located at the web site: <http://www.wayoflife.org/publications/index.html>. Way of Life Literature, P.O. Box 610368, Port Huron, MI 48061. 866-295-4143, fbns@wayoflife.org. We do not solicit funds from those who do not agree with our preaching and who are not helped by these publications, but only from those who are. OFFERINGS can be made at <http://www.wayoflife.org/wayoflife/makeanoffering.html>. PAYPAL offerings can be made to <https://www.paypal.com/xclick/business=dcloud%40wayoflife.org>

WAY OF LIFE LITERATURE SHARING POLICY: Much of our material is available for free, such as the hundreds of articles at the Way of Life web site. Other items we sell to help fund our very expensive literature, video, and foreign church planting ministry. Way of Life's content falls into two categories: sharable and non-sharable. Things that we encourage you to share include the audio sermons, video presentations, O Timothy magazine, and FBIS articles. You are free to make copies of these at your own expense and share them with friends and family. You are also welcome to use excerpts from the articles. All we ask is that you give proper credit. Things we do not want copied and distributed freely are items like the Fundamental Baptist Digital Library, print edition of our books, PDFs of the books, etc. These items have taken years to produce at enormous expense in time and money, and we need the income from the sale of these to help fund the ministry. We trust that your Christian honesty will preserve the integrity of this policy.